Vol. XI, No. 20 HUMAN EVENTS May 19, 1954

MAY 26 1954

A SOLUTION OF OUR PUBLIC SCHOOL PROBLEM
(brought up to date)

By FRANK CHODOROV

THE DECISION OF the Supreme Court outlawing racial segregation in the public schools involves constitutional and social questions that go far beyond the immediate issue.

First of all, it marks another step in the direction of the centralization of power in the Federal government, another effort to destroy state autonomy and abolish local government — the ultimate end of which is absolutism. Every absolutist government in the history of the world was preceded by the liquidation of local authority, the only level at which the will of the people can be effectively expressed. Disregarding the merits or demerits of segregation, there are communities in this country where feeling on the subject runs high. The decision simply means that the Federal government has undertaken to disregard the prevailing sentiment in these communities and to force these people to be "good."

In short, the decision is in line with the trend toward the dissolution of the Union and its replacement with something not contemplated by the Founding Fathers.

Next, there is the odd clause in the decision which gives the states some months in which they can rearrange their affairs so as to comply with the decision. This is purely a legislative, not a judicial matter. The Supreme Court is supposed to decide on the constitutionality of laws. Having so decided, it has no constitutional warrant for recommending ways and means for carrying out of their decisions, or to specify the time when such decisions shall go into effect. In the clause referred to, the Supreme Court has again shown an inclination to impinge on the legislative branch of government, or to intervene in political affairs.

Beyond these legal matters is the effect the decision will have on the public school system. Anticipating this decision, the people of South Carolina last year authorized their legislature to abolish the public education clause in the state constitution. If the legislature — which, we are advised, will be called into special session before the opening of the next school year for this purpose — does drop the state's public school system and takes steps to encourage the establishment of private schools, the result should be far-reaching: it may be the first step in divorcing our educational system from political influence.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1954 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Last year, HUMAN EVENTS published my article "A Solution of the Public School Problem." In view of the decision of the Supreme Court, the argument is more pertinent now than it was then. The following is the gist of the argument. We reprint it with the hope that folks who are concerned with the trend in education will broadcast the "solution" — which the decision of the Supreme Court and the anticipated action of South Carolina have brought to the fore. And editors are invited to reprint to their hearts' content.

WHATEVER IS WRONG with the public school system, including the voodooism of the New Education, is due to the compulsory attendance laws and the compulsory taxes which support it. The public school is a socialized or politically monopolized institution, and suffers from the weaknesses inherent in all monopolies. The only thing that prevents the public school from decaying completely is the fact that it is not a complete monopoly. Local control of the school gives the taxpayer and parent some say in its management, even to the point of occasionally throwing out the "progressive" faddism. If the plans of the Educationists succeed, if the public school is centrally managed by an entrenched bureaucracy, then the present faults of the school will seem insignificant; it will be a political department, not a place of learning.

Nothing will do more to better education in America than the breaking of the public school trust. And if it is broken, nothing else need be done to eradicate its faults.

This is not a proposal to abolish public schools. It is a proposal to put them into competition with free enterprise schools, so that they can prove their worth. And this can be done by the remission to parents of the taxes they are compelled to pay to support politically-controlled schools, in an amount comparable to what they pay for private schooling. The method of effecting this remission — whether by deductions from income taxes or allowances from local levies — is a technical matter; if the principle were established that a parent has the right to buy the educational service he deems best for his child, the fiscal problem of tax remission could easily be solved.

Suppose this were done. Suppose the parents were given the choice of supporting public schools or buying education more to their liking. The current bitter quarrel between parents and "progressive" education would vanish; for parents could withdraw their offspring from the schools that employ this system and patronize schools that do not. Those who decry the lack of religious training in the public school would send their children to denominational schools, which they could well do because they would have the money to support more of them; the "double taxation" complaint of the parochial school people would be put to rest. Socialists could establish and support their own schools, while the rest of us would not be worried about the subjection of our children of these doctrines, and at our expense; the furor about Communist infiltration in the schools would die down.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There would be a welter of schools competing for trade. Some would stress esthetics, others languages, others would go in for utilitarian courses, and so on. Every enterprising pedagog with an educational idea, either as to method or subject matter, would put it on display for possible customers to examine. Mothers of children about to enter school would consult with others of more experience to find the one that to her seems best suited for her budding genius. There would be at least as much parental interest in education as, for instance, there is in the proper feeding of the child; mothers would not just dump their offspring into the public lap. The schools that turned out the best product, through the child, would rise to the top, and the least competent would fall by the wayside. And there would be no fuss about it. The marketplace would decide.

Incidentally, the argument that private schools develop snobbery would be pointless if the tax-remission proposal were adopted. With private schools on "every corner," patronized by people in all walks of life, they would cease to be symbols of wealth and their exclusiveness would vanish.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS would prosper by this competition. Since the more successful private schools would be able to offer their teachers higher wages, they would attract the better minds. The public schools, to stay in business, would have to meet these wage-scales, which they would be able to do, since the competition would compel them to drop their expensive gadgets and experiments. If the authorities persisted in hiring low-priced teachers, they would get only that kind, and the private schools would get more trade.

The problem of overcrowded classes would solve itself. Even if only twenty-five per cent of the public school population were diverted to private and parochial schools, the strain on seating capacity would be eased; perhaps the impossible problem of trying to teach fifty pupils in a class would be solved. The shift might be great enough to make unnecessary a constantly increasing building program, thus relieving the community of a growing bonded indebtedness and a rising tax rate. Fewer buildings would make for better buildings, which competition from the superior physical facilities offered by the private school would force the community to provide.

In short, there are no faults in the public school that competition would not eradicate. And the improvement would come easily and automatically, entirely without resort to political methods. The mere matter of tax remission would settle all our school problems.

This proposal commends itself also because it is in line with the democratic principle. The Educationists make much of the word democracy, though they do not define it; it apparently serves as an amorphous endorsement of anything they approve. If democracy means anything, it describes a social or political system in which freedom of choice prevails. So that, if the parent is compelled to accept, and pay for, any kind of education

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that a majority (or controlling minority) dishes out, the democratic principle is certainly violated.

Yet the Educationists are dead set against freedom of choice in their appropriated field. Whenever parents presume to question their programs or methods, they are touched to the quick. How dare the biological parents butt in on the mental development of their offspring! Having brought forth a child, their competence is at an end; without a degree from an accredited teachers' college they simply cannot have a valid opinion on its mental upbringing. That is a matter reserved for the fraternity of "experts."

ONE OF THEIR shining lights, the former president of Harvard University, shed some light on the "democratic" attitude of the Educationists in a word. (They always have a word.) The private school, he declared, is bad because it makes for "divisiveness," which means differences of opinion, variations in values, expressions of choice, preferences and discrimination. The opposite of "divisiveness" is conformity. But, this "divisiveness" is of the essence of democracy, as well as a necessary condition for progress. Where it is not permitted, where conformity is imposed, there is neither scope for intellectual curiosity nor freedom. And, certainly, no democracy.

This urgency for conformity (democratic conformity, of course) complements the expertise argument. In private schools, which do not come within their purview, children might get an education, and that would not do; the fraternity's quackery, including their claim to scientific exactitude in all things educative, would be exposed. Their propaganda, therefore, is addressed to the necessity of extending political control of schools, through federal aid and legislation, and to decrying any tendency on the part of parents to escape from their clutches. They most assuredly would not relish an increase in the number of private schools. The suggestion has even been advanced that the accrediting of teachers be limited by law to certain designated teachers' colleges.

It can be seen that what the Educationists are driving toward, whether they know it or not, is the educational system that obtained in ancient Sparta, where the child became the ward of the State once it entered school. And for that, American parents are not quite ready; they still believe that they have parental rights and duties which the State cannot abrogate. They would be in a better position to exercise their rights and fulfill their duties as parents if they were given more latitude in the selection of their children's schooling. The suggestion to make possible a greater freedom of choice through tax remission is democratic, if nothing else.

Additional Copies: 6—1.00; 10—1.50; 50—5.50; 100—10.00; 500—15.00; 1,000—25.00.
Quotations for larger quantities on request.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* FRANK CHODOROV, *Associate Editor*

Vol. XI, No. 20 Wednesday, May 19, 1954 Washington, D. C.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA MAY 26 1954

Segregation: See this week's HUMAN EVENTS supplement for comment on the explosive Supreme Court decision of the past 48 hours, and for a suggested solution for the whole public school problem.

The McCarthy Impasse: On March 17, HUMAN EVENTS warned that McCarthy had come close to the nerve center, the Army civilian bureaucracy, which started the rumpus over Cohn and Schine. That nerve ganglion was exposed when John G. Adams, the protagonist of the bureaucracy, admitted that on January 21 McCarthy told the Army he was going to issue subpoenas to the members of the Army Loyalty Review Board to appear before the committee and seek to discover why the security risks had been coddled; (2) that swift action resulted when a "high-level" White House conference took place and that this prompted the counter-attack of the Army on McCarthy, that is, the allegation that Cohn and Schine had sought favors from the Army.

Thus the Army Loyalty Board stands unbared as the pathological area of the Army, of such acute sensitivity that as a consequence a whole nation hung over their TV sets for weeks. Here was the reason why regular Army officers, incensed over infiltration within their ranks, were silenced when they "went upstairs" to warn the generals. Here was the same mechanism that worked in the State Department between 1947 and 1950, a period during which — as Buckley and Bozell point out in their book *McCarthy and His Enemies* — literally *nothing* was done by the State Department to oust security risks. Here was the reason why an exposé of infiltration in the Army Signal Corps was smothered in 1952.

And why the special sensitivity of the nerve tumor? The Department of the Army had during the war received an increment of blood that was not good — fellow travellers, "liberals," pro-Soviet elements which produced a scrap in Army G2, in 1944-5, between the pro-Soviet, pro-Roosevelt crowd and old regulars. Many of the former remained after the war. Then during the Korean war, New Dealer Anna Rosenberg became War-Manpower Administrator and many of the same elements appeared again in the Army civilian bureaucracy. And Mrs. Rosenberg was a personal friend of George C. Marshall, Walter Bedell Smith and Dwight D. Eisenhower. The painfulness of the Army pathology becomes understandable.

Meanwhile, with the hearings suspended as a result of the White House refusal to reveal what went on at the high-level conference, it is difficult to see how they can be adequately carried on otherwise. Many in Washington, while awaiting the decision, ponder McCarthy's words on the matter. He suggested that "someone contact" the President and remind him that "he and I and many others" during the 1952 presidential campaign promised the American people that if the Democrats were ousted, "the new Administration would not engage in government by secrecy, whitewash and cover up. We can't lay all the facts on the table if halfway through the hearings they draw an iron curtain."

McCarthy II: Washington observers who know the facts about Communist infiltration in the government are stunned by Ike's swift gag order on the persons attending the White House conference of January 21. Witnesses have already admitted that it was at this conference that Sherman Adams (who is already accused of being deeply involved in alleged efforts of the Administration to "get" McCarthy) directed that charges be prepared against Cohn and Schine.

In the hearings before the Senate committee investigating the Army charges against Cohn and Schine, Senator McCarthy has dealt the Administration staggering blows — establishing to the hilt the incompetence of the Army in its handling of subversives, exploding step by step the charges against Cohn and

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1954 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Schine and sustaining his contention that they were manufactured for the purpose of trying to frighten him into dropping his exposure of Communism in the Army.

The Senate committee now merely wants to know what happened at that January 21 conference at the White House. The President is not involved. It is clear from the testimony that this conference was of decisive importance in initiating the charges against Cohn and Schine. If those charges were not either trumped up or magnified beyond reason for an ulterior purpose, why shouldn't the truth be ascertained? Apparently those attending the conference are fearful of what might be found out and Ike has obligingly gagged them one and all.

His gag order sounds a little hollow in view of what he stated publicly on March 3. On that date the President released a statement about the work of the McCarthy Senate committee in which he said: "Except where the interests of the nation demand otherwise every governmental employee in the Executive Branch whether civilian or in the armed forces is expected to respond cheerfully and completely to requests of the Congress and its several committees."

The Senate committee has not asked for any information about the White House conference of January 21 even remotely affecting the national security. It merely wants to find out whether the charges preferred against Cohn and Schine were prepared in good faith or were blown up for the purpose of attempting to scare Senator McCarthy into dropping his probe of Communism in the Army.

It was Harry S. Truman who established the power of the Executive to "gag" all Federal employees — an unprecedented act in our history. *Editor and Publisher*, trade paper of the newspaper industry, promptly denounced Mr. Truman's order as "making possible a complete blackout of important news from the nation's Capital." And Sigma Delta Chi, the professional journalists' fraternity excoriated it as "duplicating the practices of totalitarian states which as (one of) their first steps, seized control of channels of communication and information to the people whom they later enslaved." During the campaign of '52 the Republicans flayed the Truman Administration for its gag rule as a flagrant abuse of Executive power. But the Eisenhower Administration instead of correcting this obvious evil has, like the Truman Administration, employed it to cover up its acts.

War: Our sources report that we are committed to action in Indo-China if the Communists do not behave. At present all the evidence points to the Communists not behaving. There is little doubt that the Reds aim to conquer all Indo-China.

Will we have Allies if we intervene in Indo-China? Probably the paper variety we have been having. Opinion is that England will contribute next to nothing while the French will contribute less. And while we are intervening both the British and French will trade actively with the Kremlin and Red China.

Observers say that our intervention in Indo-China will begin through the air. Initially, planes from carriers and from the Philippines are contemplated. But, since the Communists have submarines in the South China Sea our carriers might be frightened off and eventually we would have to have air bases in Indo-China guarded by American troops. From there on we would be sucked in deeper and deeper until another Korean situation emerges.

Our intervention in Indo-China will amuse the Kremlin whose strategy is to induce the U.S., with only 5% of the world's population, to spread American military power thin over Europe and Asia and exhaust ourselves as much as possible financially before the final showdown with the Kremlin. Competent military experts ask frankly "why try to save Indo-China?" Saving Indo-China won't protect India where the Reds already control Tibet (northern invasion route into India) and have Nehru for a docile spokesman. It wouldn't prevent Communist infiltration from controlling Thailand, as has already happened in Burma.

Are Malaya and Indonesia worth more sacrifice of American boys or money? Indonesia is already penetrated by Reds. Suppose we did lose Indonesian rubber and Malayan rubber and tin? In the last war the Japanese shut us off completely from these war materials for five years. Yet we met our own requirements and in addition supplied our Allies. Today we have large reserves in both rubber and tin.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Russia fears only one thing: that we may be intelligent enough to concentrate on overwhelming air power which alone offers any chance of knocking the Kremlin galley-west. If, however, we continue to fritter away our air power in Korea, then in Indo-China and other places where the Kremlin chooses a battlefield and Russia is left free to bend all her efforts to accumulating air power for a strike at the U.S.A., we will find ourselves in great danger.

Break With Russia: When Senators Jenner and McCarran launched their resolution on May 15 for severance of diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia, they may or may not have had the atom bomb in mind. They may have sought only to "regularize" the status as between the U.S. and a government which has grossly violated its commitments and interfered in our domestic affairs. But, if they had listened to talk among officials charged with our security, they could have received additional inspiration for their project which is privately opposed, we understand, by the ineffable Senator Wiley (Wisc., Rep.), head of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee which passes upon the resolution.

For, one of the things which furrows the brows of security experts is what Soviet agents in the Soviet consulates may be doing about atom bombs. It is the considered opinion of these experts that parts of an atom (but not hydrogen) bomb could be smuggled into a large consulate building and there assembled, for a mission which eventually could do enormous damage to, say, the port of New York. These experts claim that there is no way of detecting scientifically such an operation; neither Geiger counters nor other apparatus could give our officials warning.

Hence, when Jenner and McCarran go to work on the Senate floor on the much overdue resolution, fighting for the elimination of these deadly beachheads on our own soil, which would follow immediately on breaking relations with the Soviet Union, something will undoubtedly be said along this line to reinforce affirmative arguments in perhaps the most epochal debate in the history of the Senate.

Not Merely Gossip: Now that Secretary of State Dulles' stock has descended, his subordinate, Undersecretary Walter Bedell ("Beedle") Smith, is at it again. On June 3, 1953, this column reported that Smith privately made no bones about his ambition to succeed Dulles (then in a temporary state of eclipse). Dulles however recovered lost ground only to lose it again recently as a result of the Geneva Conference debacle. Now "Beedle" Smith is reportedly "mending his fences" on Capitol Hill, since he has had some doubts about whether or not he could win confirmation, if named. It is believed that he has made some progress, particularly since his testimony before the McCarthy hearings. When he was on the stand he dealt with the Cohn-Schine affair in such terms as to warm the heart of McCarthy supporters.

● Harold Stassen, head of the Foreign Operations Administration of the State Department, is ambitious to bring more power under his realm, the field of foreign spending — in a way characteristic of this go-getting bureaucrat. He reportedly seeks to have the Export-Import Bank closed up as an independent agency and placed under his FOA. As people on Capitol Hill see it, Stassen could thereby lend money to a lot of new national clients abroad, perhaps even Soviet Russia.

● Reports from Massachusetts say that one Democratic aspirant for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1956 has apparently lost his chances as a result of his anti-McCarthyism. Elmer Nelson, GOP Chairman in the Bay State, says the result of the TV hearings has been to "kill off a Democratic candidate for President — Senator Stuart Symington." Massachusetts is a key state in any Democratic nominating campaign and it has had a large and loyal McCarthy following. Indeed, so strong is the McCarthy following that Senator Saltonstall (Rep., Mass.) is showing a warm amiability toward Joe on the Hill that attracts notice. Saltonstall is running for re-election next fall.

● Observers here, in view of the McCarthy-Ike split, are wondering when and by whom the first attempt at party realignment will be made. Southern Democrats and Taft Republicans in Congress alike find Ike blocking the way to the truth about subversion in the Department of the Army. These observers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

look eagerly at Senator Jenner of Indiana, Republican, and head of the powerful Rules Committee. Although they have received no coverage in the eastern metropolitan press, several speeches by Jenner in recent months embody impassioned pleas for states rights (now to the fore in Southern minds since the segregation decision of the Court), and so thoughts turn toward realignment. Hence eyes in the Senate press gallery are on the Indianan.

Dewey: If "Rum, Romanism and Rebellion" withered the political ambitions of the brilliant Blaine in the eighties, Governor Thomas Dewey's recent advice to the nation's consumers to switch to milk as the remedy for soaring coffee prices may have an equally catastrophic effect. The man in Albany, twice decisively whipped by the Democrats in his bid for the Presidency, has been for some time — according to reliable reports — interested in becoming Secretary of State in President Eisenhower's Cabinet. And the New York Governor was considered to have a good chance to supplant Secretary Dulles who has recently lost popular favor after Geneva — that is, until Thomas made the mistake of posing for the press with a big tumbler of milk in his hands and opposed the coffee interests.

Advised economist Dewey: The way to bring coffee prices down is to drink less of it and fill the void with "healthier, cheaper and more plentiful milk." Immediately Carlos Muniz, Brazilian Ambassador to the United States, issued a protest to the press. Brazil produces half of the world's coffee supply and Muniz pointedly remarked that "the peoples of the coffee-producing nations of Latin America will greatly resent this action by Governor Dewey which cannot but prove to be shortsighted and ill-advised since it will reflect harshly on the hemispheric solidarity so vital to the free world today." Muniz was followed by Alfonso Patino, acting head of the Colombian Embassy in Washington. Patino went after Dewey at the State Department and said Dewey "contradicts in a shocking way everything said by Secretary of State Dulles regarding inter-American relations at the recent Caracas conference."

With the Administration all out to gain favor with Latin America, Dewey's stock in the State Department, as a potential successor to Dulles, has fallen sharply, (while that of "Beedle" Smith — see *Not Merely Gossip* above — has taken a jump.)

Bustless Economy: "One of the great basic facts of the present business and economic situation," says the *Wall Street Journal*, "is that in terms of prices for goods the inflation of two wars is still with us." And then the financial paper asks the rhetorical question — when will the readjustment to lower levels take place? What it is really anxious about, what we are all anxious about, is the possibility of a "bust," such as has followed every war in the past.

The "bust" is a precipitous decline in values, following a post-war speculative period. It occurs when people wake up to the fact that the rise in values — the "boom" — is unwarranted. They suddenly realize that the things they have been bidding up — like goods, land and securities — are in good supply and are not worth the prices they have been putting on them. The "bust" is really a squeezing out of speculative values.

But the condition necessary for a "bust" is a reasonably steady amount of money in circulation. That condition has not existed since Franklin D. Roosevelt abolished the gold standard, enabling the government to increase the money supply at will. Since 1934 the government has been operating beyond its income, resorting to printed money (or its equivalent) whenever that suited the spending policy. With more and more money in the hands of the purchasers, there could be no decline in the bidding. The "boom" has been continuous, and, judging by the thinking of top-drawer economists in government, is to be kept alive as long as possible. Whenever prices begin to fall, the government will use its "arsenal of weapons"— meaning more profligacy — to inject more purchasing power into the market. If the consumer protests that prices are too high, there are ways of getting more money into his pockets, so that he can pay more for the things he wants.

The odd thing about this inflationary business is that, under a relatively free economy, production is temporarily stimulated. The high prices attract the entrepreneur, and things come into existence by the lure of profits. But, this increase in production tends to bring prices down, to induce a "bust," which is again avoided by government spending sprees, with the consequent increase in money. (Incidentally, that explains the enthusiasm of financial institutions for foreign spending, and their support of political candidates who are in favor of it.)

Sometimes the spending is too precipitous even for the government and its "economists," as during war or the preparation for war. Prices rise too fast for the speed of the government printing presses. Then the government tries to hold them down by "controls." Right now, with trouble in the Orient brewing, there is talk in Administration circles of asking Congress for "stand-by controls." The "controls" do not control; they make black markets.

At any rate, there is no prospect of a "bust" in the foreseeable future. Values will be kept high by more and more paper dollars, each of which will lose its purchasing power. The bubble will burst, of course, but only a rash prophet will set a date.

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. First class mail, one year, $11.00; six months, $6.00. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED